

REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-19, 22-34, 37, 38, 40-49 and 51-54. Claims 1, 19, 26, 34, 40, 47, 51, 53 and 54 are amended herein. No new matter is presented. Thus, claims 1-19, 22-34, 37, 37, 40-49 and 51-54 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 1-19, 22-34, 37, 38, 40-49 and 51-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,757,343 (Nagakubo) and U.S. Patent No. 6,034,655 (You).

At item 5 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner emphasizes that Nagakubo FIGS. 3A-3D, and 6-9 "clearly discloses adjusting amplitudes of the input primary color video signals in accordance with the luminance level (e.g., different luminance levels in different modes as shown in FIGS. 3A-3D, 6-9)." However, Nagakubo in Abstract, column 3, lines 19-23 and column 5, lines 38+, discusses adjusting the number of times of emission according to a set luminance adjustment level to adjust luminance of the plasma display.

With respect to white balance control, the Examiner newly relies on You. The Office Action on page 3 provides "You is cited to teach a plasma device including a white balance adjusting section (see, col. 4, lines 32 to col. 6, line 5). However, You fails to disclose or suggest to one skilled in the art a method of controlling the white balance in a plasma display as claimed according to the present invention.

In particular, You is directed to correcting white balance using a prescribed adjustment pattern, namely steps (1)-(4) of "displaying one frame of gradation on an entire screen of the plasma display device, (2) discharging and erasing all cells in the plasma display panel device, addressing all R cells, G cells, or B cells of the entire cells at a time, and (4) providing additional sustain pulses ..." (Abstract, column 1, lines 8-16, and column 4, line 32+). In other words, because You discusses displaying a picture and then erasing the picture to prevent all the cells from being affected by prior luminances (see, col. 4, line 50-52). As such, You fails to be directed to a continuous white balance correction while the plasma display displays a plurality of images.

You, at col. 3, lines 31-48 discusses four steps to correct the white balance, which are illustrated in FIG. 4 to include display one frame of picture on an entire screen (401), provide reset pulses to discharge and erase all cells (402), address R cells only of all cells at a time and

provide numbers of additional sustain pulses thereto on the same time (403), and similarly address G cells (404) and B cells (405). However, You's first step (402) relies on one frame of picture and then in the second step discharging and erasing all the cells (402). You's col. 4, lines 40-42 expressly discusses "The method starts with a step of displaying one frame of picture by a step identical to the conventional method (S401)," as shown in You FIG. 1. Thus, FIG. 1 fails to reasonably disclose or suggest to one skilled in the art, or to enable, the claimed detection of a luminance level of the input primary color video signals.

Further, You column 3, lines 44-48 and col. 5, line 1+ discuss that "the numbers of the additional sustain pulses to the R cells, G cells and B cells in step (4) may be made to be in an order of B cell>R cell> G cell considering luminous efficiency differences among R, G, B fluorescent materials," or "the number of additional sustain pulses provided to the R cells, G cells and B cells in the step (4) may be varied to appropriate ratios according to luminance or contrast of the screen for keeping the white balance stable regardless of variation of the luminance or contrast of the screen."

However, for determining the additional pulses in step (4), You takes into consideration the luminance efficiency differences among R, G, B fluorescent materials, or takes into consideration luminance or contrast of the screen, based upon the Table 1 (see, You dependent claims 2-3), but not based upon the claimed present invention's "detecting a luminance level of the input primary color video signals; and ... correcting white balance by adjusting amplitudes of each of the input primary color video signals respectively in accordance with said detected luminance level" (see discussion of claims below). In other words, You does not suggest to one skilled in the art to modify its white balance correction step 4 to be **a luminance level detector** based upon which amplitudes of each of the input primary color video signals respectively are adjusted in accordance with said detected luminance level to correct a white balance, because You fails to discuss anywhere or provide any suggestion to one skilled art how to determine luminous efficiency differences, or luminance or contrast of the screen. You only discusses Table 1, which is a prescribed table 1 and differs from the claimed present invention's "detecting a luminance level of the input primary color video signals" to correct a white balance.

More particularly, You fails to disclose or suggest to one skilled in the art "detecting a luminance level of the input primary color video signals" for a displayed color image to correct a white balance.

Independent claim 1, by way of example, recites "correcting white balance by adjusting amplitudes of each of the input primary color video signals of the displayed color image

respectively in accordance with said number of emissions or intensity thereof." Claims 26, 40, 51, 53 and 54 recite similar features.

Independent claim 19 recites, "correcting a white balance by adjusting output gray levels of said primary color video signals of the image in accordance with said detected input gray levels." Claim 19 further recites, "said white balance correction portion comprises a computing unit to compute gray level correction coefficients in accordance with said detected input gray levels, and a plurality of correction units to correct said detected input gray levels according to said computed gray level correction coefficients." Claims 34 and 47 recite similar features.

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over Nagakubo and You.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over Nagakubo and You. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, as recited in claim 2, "wherein said detection portion detects said number of emissions or said intensity from a display ratio of an image produced by said primary color video signals." Nagakubo and You, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest these features of dependent claim 2.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 08/04/06
1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

By: Temnit Afework
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202